

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-13 are pending in the present application. Claims 7 and 10 have been previously cancelled and claim 13 has been previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended and claims 14 and 15 are new. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 15 are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Support for the amendments and new claims may be found at least in the specification and drawings (e.g., FIG. 3) of the application as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Nagata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,624,857 B1, hereinafter "Nagata"). The Examiner states that Nagata discloses all of the elements of claims 1 and 2, primarily in FIG. 4 and column 8 lines 15-21. The Examiner also states that all of the elements of claim 9 are disclosed primarily in the last paragraph of column 25. The Examiner further states that all of the elements of claims 11 and 12 are disclosed in Nagata, primarily in the description of embodiments 1 and 2.

FIG. 4 of Nagata relied upon by the Examiner discloses inspection lines 21a, 21b and inspections lines 22a, 22b on opposite sides of the TFT array panel opposing corresponding drivers 20a and 20b, respectively.

Nagata does not teach or suggest an inspection line formed on the TFT array panel and passing under a place where the driver is formed for transmitting a test signal to the second display signal lines, as in independent claim 1. It is respectfully noted that recitation of "under" in claim 1 functions as a preposition and is defined as: below or beneath so as to be overhung, surmounted, covered, protected, or concealed by <under sunny skies> <a soft heart under a stern exterior> <under cover of darkness> (See [M-w.com](http://M-w.com)), thus defeating the Examiner's interpretation on page 2 of the Detailed Action. In particular, the Examiner states that "the inspection lines are formed at the same time as the gate and source electrodes, and then the driver 20 is connected after formation of the panel, thus the driver 20b is above the inspection lines".

The inspection line of Nagata may be formed “lower” or “below” the driver 20b, but does not “pass under” where the driver 20b is formed, as the driver 20b does not “cover” the inspection line and the driver 20b does not “overhang” the inspection line.

Therefore, amended claim 1, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-6, 8, 9 and 11-12, define over Nagata.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 12 under § 102(e) be withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 3-6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nagata in view of Kawasaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,400 B1, hereinafter “Kawasaki”). The Examiner states that Nagata discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *a plurality of straight connecting lines interconnecting chip drivers wherein the test pad is closer to an edge of the liquid crystal panel than to the connecting lines and a plurality of flexible printed circuit films attached to the liquid crystal panel, wherein the external devices are the flexible printed circuit films*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed in FIG. 8 and column 2, paragraph 8 of Kawasaki.

First it is respectfully noted that claims 3-6 and 8 depend from independent claim 1, which is submitted as being allowable for defining over Nagata as discussed above. Second, it is respectfully submitted that use of *a plurality of straight connecting lines interconnecting chip drivers wherein the test pad is closer to an edge of the liquid crystal panel than to the connecting lines and a plurality of flexible printed circuit films attached to the liquid crystal panel, wherein the external devices are the flexible printed circuit films* allegedly taught in Kawasaki, or any other disclosure of Kawasaki, does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Nagata.

In addition, FIG. 8 of Kawasaki relied upon by the Examiner, the pads are located between the driver ICs (3), thus Kawasaki has the problem of interference between the signal lines and the inspection line and pads. However, the present application has the purpose of not interfering between the signal lines and the inspection line and pads.

Kawasaki does not teach or suggest the test pad is disposed between the driver and the one edge of the TFT array panel, as in amended independent claim 1, from which claims 3-6 and 8 depend.

Moreover, regarding the rejection of claim 8, the Examiner states that “the test pad is closer to an edge of the liquid crystal panel than to the connecting lines” on page 3 of the Detailed Action is disclosed in Kawasaki. However, referring to Fig. 8 of Kawasaki, the comments of the Examiner are not correct, as the pads are located between the driver ICs (3), as discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 3-6 and 8 under § 103(a) be withdrawn.

#### ***New Claim 15***

New independent claim 15 has been added to particularly point out and distinctly claim that the test pad is disposed between the driving signal lines, line 522 and line 523 in fig. 3. It is respectfully submitted that features are not disclosed in Nagata and Kawasaki.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the claim 15 defines over Nagata and Kawasaki.

***Conclusion***

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/  
James J. Merrick  
Registration No. 43,801  
Confirmation No. 7173  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
20 Church Street 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Hartford, CT 06103  
PTO Customer No. 23413  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Date: January 29, 2008